

**TTP 93-4**  
February 1993

# **The Top Width<sup>1</sup>**

## **Theoretical update**

Marek Jezabek<sup>2</sup>

*Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kawioro 26a, PL-30055 Cracow, Poland*

and

Johann H. Kühn

*Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik, Universität Karlsruhe  
Kaiserstr. 12, Postfach 6980, 7500 Karlsruhe 1, Germany*

### **Abstract**

A critical assessment of the available calculations of the top quark width is presented. QCD corrections, the finite mass of the  $b$  quark and the effect of the  $W$  width are included as well as the electroweak corrections. The relative importance of these corrections is demonstrated for the realistic range of top masses. For the QCD corrected decay rate we use the formulae from [1] and include the electroweak correction taken from [2]. Our results differ from those available in the literature because all the later calculations ignored the effect of  $W$  width discussed earlier in [1]. This leads to an effect comparable in size to the electroweak correction.

---

<sup>1</sup>Work partly supported by the BMFT Contract 055KA94P, and by the Polish Committee for Scientific Research (KBN) Grants No. 203809101 and 223729102.

<sup>2</sup>E-mail: jezbek@chopin.ifj.edu.pl; Alexander von Humboldt Foundation Fellow

# 1 Introduction and summary

The discovery of the top quark has been anticipated since many years at accelerators of increasing energy. Present hopes are based on analyses of high precision data and the standard theory, see [3]. The top is the first heavy quark whose mass can be measured to better than 1% precision at a future  $e^+e^-$  collider. Therefore, measurements of its width will not only test the standard model at the Born level, but also the QCD radiative corrections which are of order 10% [1]. This is in contrast to  $b$  and  $c$  quarks, where uncertainties in the masses and non-perturbative effects preclude this possibility.

Recently, the complete one loop electroweak corrections to the total rate have been also calculated [2, 4], and turned out to be rather small (1-2%). Nevertheless, it has been claimed [2, 4] that a precise measurement of the top width may serve as a consistency check for the electroweak sector of the standard model. In fact a number of calculations have been performed studying electroweak effects on the top width in theories extending the standard model [6]. In particular it has been found that the additional corrections from the extended Higgs sector of the minimal supersymmetric standard model are significantly smaller than 1%.

In this article we give the standard model predictions for the top quark width. Our results are different from those in [2, 4] because we include the effect of  $W$  boson width considered in [1] and neglected in later works. This effect is comparable in size to the electroweak corrections. A number of intrinsic uncertainties remains. The present uncertainty in  $\alpha_s$  and the ignorance concerning the QCD correction of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$  limit the accuracy of the prediction to about 1-2%. One has to take into account also the errors, both experimental and theoretical, in the determination of the top mass.

At present the best place for a precise determination of  $\Gamma_t$  is believed to be the threshold region for  $t\bar{t}$  production in  $e^+e^-$  annihilation. The most optimistic current estimate of the relative precision is 5% [5]. Therefore, it is mandatory to give the theory prediction which as the one presented in this article is accurate up to order of 1%.

## 2 QCD corrected decay rate

We assume throughout three families of quarks. Thus the effects of CKM mixing are negligible. The QCD corrected width of the top quark is given by the following formula [1]:

$$\Gamma^{(1)} = \frac{G_F^2 m_t^5}{192\pi^3} \left( 9 + 6 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right) \int_0^{(1-\epsilon)^2} \frac{dy}{(1-y/\bar{y})^2 + \gamma^2} \left[ F_0(y, \epsilon) - \frac{2\alpha_s}{3\pi} F_1(y, \epsilon) \right] \quad (1)$$

where

$$\bar{y} = (M_W/m_t)^2, \quad \epsilon = m_b/m_t, \quad \gamma = \Gamma_W/M_W$$

and

$$\Gamma_W = \frac{G_F M_W^3}{6\sqrt{2}\pi} \left( 9 + 6\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right) \quad (2)$$

The functions  $F_0(y, \epsilon)$  and  $F_1(y, \epsilon)$  read <sup>3</sup>

$$F_0(y, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)} \mathcal{C}_0(y, \epsilon) \quad (3)$$

where

$$\lambda(u, v, w) = u^2 + v^2 + w^2 - 2(uv + vw + wu) \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_0(y, \epsilon) = 4[(1 - \epsilon^2)^2 + y(1 + \epsilon^2) - 2y^2] \quad , \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(y, \epsilon) = & \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{C}_0(y, \epsilon) (1 + \epsilon^2 - y) \left[ 2\pi^2/3 + 4\text{Li}_2(u_w) - 4\text{Li}_2(u_q) \right. \\ & - 4\text{Li}_2(u_q u_w) - 4 \ln u_q \ln(1 - u_q) - 2 \ln u_w \ln u_q + \ln y \ln u_q + 2 \ln \epsilon \ln u_w \\ & \left. - 2F_0(y, \epsilon) \left[ \ln y + 3 \ln \epsilon - 2 \ln \lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2) \right] \right. \\ & + 4(1 - \epsilon^2) \left[ (1 - \epsilon^2)^2 + y(1 + \epsilon^2) - 4y^2 \right] \ln u_w \\ & + \left[ 3 - \epsilon^2 + 11\epsilon^4 - \epsilon^6 + y(6 - 12\epsilon^2 + 2\epsilon^4) - y^2(21 + 5\epsilon^2) + 12y^3 \right] \ln u_q \\ & + 6\sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)} (1 - \epsilon^2)(1 + \epsilon^2 - y) \ln \epsilon \\ & \left. + \sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)} \left[ -5 + 22\epsilon^2 - 5\epsilon^4 - 9y(1 + \epsilon^2) + 6y^2 \right] \right] \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$u_q = \frac{1 + \epsilon^2 - y - \sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)}}{1 + \epsilon^2 - y + \sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)}} \quad (7)$$

$$u_w = \frac{1 - \epsilon^2 + y - \sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)}}{1 - \epsilon^2 + y + \sqrt{\lambda(1, y, \epsilon^2)}} \quad (8)$$

Above threshold for real W production the rate (1) can be approximated by:

$$\Gamma_{nw}^{(1)} = \frac{G_F m_t^3}{16\sqrt{2}\pi} \left[ F_0(\bar{y}, \epsilon) - \frac{2\alpha_s}{3\pi} F_1(\bar{y}, \epsilon) \right] \quad , \quad (9)$$

a result valid in the narrow width approximation.

---

<sup>3</sup>We slightly simplify an original formula from [1] using relations between dilogarithms.

Neglecting  $\epsilon$  one arrives at the following relatively compact expressions:

$$F_0(y, 0) = 2(1 - y)^2(1 + 2y) \quad (10)$$

and<sup>4</sup>:

$$f(y) = F_1(y, 0)/F_0(y, 0) = \frac{2\pi^2}{3} - \frac{5}{2} + 2 \ln y \ln(1 - y) + 4\text{Li}_2 y - 2y + \frac{1}{1 + 2y} \left[ (5 + 4y) \ln(1 - y) + \frac{2y \ln y}{1 - y} - \frac{4y^3(1 - y + \ln y)}{(1 - y)^2} \right] \quad (11)$$

The formula (1) has been derived in [1] and tested in [7, 8]. When applied to charm decays, i.e. in the four fermion limit, it reproduces the numerical results for the total rate [9].

The formulae (3-6) including the  $b$  quark mass corrections have been tested by a numerical calculation in [7]. Although performed by the same authors this calculation should be considered an independent one since it was based on a completely different technique and matrix elements equivalent to those derived in the classic papers on muon decays [10] in a form adopted in [11] for charm decays. Furthermore we have observed that these formulae after an appropriate analytical continuation are equivalent to formulae in [12] describing vacuum polarization effects from heavy quarks in the  $W$  boson propagator.

Independent calculations including non-zero  $b$  quark mass have been performed in [2] and [4]. The authors found a numerical agreement of their results with the formulae (3-6).

The massless limit, eqs. (10-11), derived in [1] was rederived and confirmed by a number of groups [13]-[15].

We proceed now to the discussion of the numerical predictions for the decay rate and the quality of different approximations. As our input we use:  $M_W = 80.10$  GeV [3],  $m_b = 4.7$  GeV,  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = .118 \pm .007$  [16] and  $M_Z = 91.187$  GeV [3].

Then  $\alpha_s(m_t)$  is derived from the formula

$$\alpha_s(Q) = \frac{4\pi}{b_0 \ln Q^2/\Lambda^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{b_1}{b_0^2} \frac{\ln \ln Q^2/\Lambda^2}{\ln Q^2/\Lambda^2} \right] \quad (12)$$

$$b_0 = 11 - \frac{2}{3}N_f, \quad b_1 = 102 - \frac{38}{3}N_f$$

---

<sup>4</sup>This form clearly exhibits limiting behavior

$$f(y) = \frac{2\pi^2}{3} - \frac{5}{2} - 3y(1 + y \ln y) + \dots$$

for small  $y$ , and

$$f(y) = 3 \ln(1 - y) + \frac{4\pi^2}{3} - \frac{9}{2} + \dots$$

for  $y \rightarrow 1^-$ . Although stated in the text, these limits are not manifest in the original formula given in [1].

for  $N_f=5$  quark flavours. Uncertainties in the input value of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  as well as the second order corrections  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ , which have not been calculated yet, lead to an error which we estimate to be of order 1%. In Table 1 we give our results for the widths obtained from different approximations as well as from the formula (1). Since most other authors present their results in comparison with the zeroth-order result  $\Gamma_{nw}^{(0)}$  obtained in the narrow width approximation, we define

$$\delta^{(i)} = \Gamma^{(i)}/\Gamma_{nw}^{(0)} - 1 \quad (13)$$

where  $i = 0, 1$  corresponds to the Born and the QCD corrected rate respectively, and the widths in the numerators include the effects of the W propagator, cf. eq. (1). Analogously we define  $\delta_{nw}^{(1)}$  which is given by the ratio of the QCD corrected and the Born widths, both evaluated in the narrow width approximation, and  $\delta_{nw}^{(1)}(0)$  for massless  $b$  quark.

| $m_t$<br>(GeV) | $\alpha_s(m_t)$ | $\Gamma_{nw}^{(0)}$<br>(GeV) | $\delta^{(0)}$<br>(%) | $\delta_{nw}^{(1)}(0)$<br>(%) | $\delta_{nw}^{(1)}$<br>(%) | $\delta^{(1)}$<br>(%) | $\Gamma^{(1)}$<br>(GeV) | $\delta_{ew}$<br>(%) | $\Gamma_t$<br>(GeV) |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 90.0           | .118            | .0234                        | 11.69                 | 7.88                          | -3.81                      | 6.56                  | .0249                   | 0.81                 | .0251               |
| 100.0          | .116            | .0931                        | 0.16                  | -4.56                         | -6.91                      | -6.89                 | .0867                   | 1.04                 | .0876               |
| 110.0          | .115            | .1955                        | -1.44                 | -6.81                         | -7.83                      | -9.22                 | .1775                   | 1.20                 | .1796               |
| 120.0          | .113            | .3265                        | -1.78                 | -7.61                         | -8.20                      | -9.89                 | .2942                   | 1.33                 | .2982               |
| 130.0          | .112            | .4849                        | -1.82                 | -7.97                         | -8.37                      | -10.08                | .4360                   | 1.43                 | .4423               |
| 140.0          | .111            | .6708                        | -1.77                 | -8.15                         | -8.44                      | -10.10                | .6031                   | 1.51                 | .6122               |
| 150.0          | .110            | .8852                        | -1.69                 | -8.25                         | -8.47                      | -10.05                | .7962                   | 1.57                 | .8087               |
| 160.0          | .109            | 1.130                        | -1.60                 | -8.31                         | -8.49                      | -9.99                 | 1.017                   | 1.62                 | 1.033               |
| 170.0          | .108            | 1.405                        | -1.52                 | -8.34                         | -8.49                      | -9.91                 | 1.266                   | 1.67                 | 1.287               |
| 180.0          | .107            | 1.714                        | -1.45                 | -8.35                         | -8.48                      | -9.84                 | 1.546                   | 1.70                 | 1.572               |
| 190.0          | .106            | 2.059                        | -1.39                 | -8.36                         | -8.47                      | -9.77                 | 1.857                   | 1.73                 | 1.890               |
| 200.0          | .106            | 2.440                        | -1.33                 | -8.36                         | -8.46                      | -9.70                 | 2.203                   | 1.76                 | 2.242               |

Table 1: Top width as a function of top mass and the comparison of the different approximations.

### 3 Electroweak corrections

The complete one loop electroweak correction to the standard model top decay have been calculated in [2] and [4]. If the lowest order width is parametrized by  $G_F$  and  $M_W$ , cf. eqs. (1) and (9), the electroweak corrections are less than 2% for realistic top masses. In particular there are no sizable effects arising from Yukawa couplings [17]<sup>5</sup>. For  $100 \text{ GeV} \leq m_t \leq 200 \text{ GeV}$

<sup>5</sup>We thank Andre Hoang for checking that this important result is in agreement with [2] when the latter calculation is restricted to the leading  $\mathcal{O}(m_t^2/M_W^2)$  contribution [18].

and Higgs mass  $M_H \geq 100 \text{ GeV}$  the potentially large  $\mathcal{O}(m_t^2/M_W^2)$  contribution from the diagrams with Yukawa couplings are smaller than 0.2% , and hence much smaller than other, subleading in  $m_t$  terms. The dependence of the correction on  $M_H$  is weak; see [2] for details. In the following we assume  $M_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$  .

Strictly speaking  $m_t$ ,  $M_Z$ ,  $M_W$ , and  $M_H$  cannot be treated as independent parameters. The standard model and the existing data imply a relation between them. For our choice of the masses one can neglect this effect, provided  $m_t$  is not too close to the present experimental lower limit. The corresponding change of the Born width is -2.6%, -0.8%, and less than 0.3% for  $m_t = 90, 100$ , and  $\geq 110 \text{ GeV}$ , respectively. Therefore we ignore the above mentioned relation and treat all the masses as independent parameters. If the measured  $M_W$  and  $M_H$  turned out to be very different from the values assumed in this paper, it would be straightforward to evaluate the corresponding change of the Born width.

The width of the top quark including the electroweak correction can be evaluated from the formula

$$\Gamma_t = \Gamma^{(1)} [1 + \delta_{ew}] \quad , \quad (14)$$

and a simple parametrization

$$\delta_{ew}(\%) \approx 2 - 1.5\bar{y} \quad (15)$$

has been obtained by us from Table 1 in [2]. The results for  $\Gamma_t$  calculated using (14) and (15) are given in our Table 1.

It should be noted that the size of the electroweak corrections is comparable to the uncertainties from as yet uncalculated  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$  corrections and the present uncertainty in the value of  $\alpha_s$ . The electroweak corrections are furthermore sensitive to the details of the Higgs sector, as exemplified by the recent calculations in the context of the two Higgs doublet model [6] .

## Acknowledgements

M.J. thanks Lalit Sehgal for a conversation which stimulated writing this report. He would like also to acknowledge a research fellowship from the Alexander-von-Humboldt Foundation which enabled his stay in the Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik - Univ. of Karlsruhe, where a part of this work was done, and to thank the members of the physics faculty there for warm hospitality and stimulating atmosphere.

## References

- [1] M. Jezabek and J.H. Kühn, *Nucl. Phys.* **B314** (1989) 1.
- [2] A. Denner and T. Sack, *Nucl. Phys.* **B358** (1991) 46.
- [3] L. Rolandi, *Precision Test of the Electroweak Interactions*, plenary talk at the XXVI ICHEP 1992, Dallas, August 1992; preprint CERN-PPE/92-175.
- [4] G. Eilam, R.R. Mendel, R. Migneron and A. Soni, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991) 3105.
- [5] K. Fujii, talk at the workshop: *Studies of Top Quarks at Colliding-Beam Facilities*, Madison, November 1992.
- [6] B. Grzadkowski and W. Hollik, preprint MPI-PH-91-82, Munich, 1991; A. Denner and A. Hoang, preprint TTP 92-24, Karlsruhe, 1992.
- [7] M. Jezabek and J.H. Kühn, *Phys. Lett.* **207B** (1988) 91; see Appendix C of [8] for details.
- [8] M. Jezabek and J.H. Kühn, *Nucl. Phys.* **B320** (1989) 20.
- [9] N. Cabibbo and L. Maiani, *Phys. Lett.* **79B** (1978) 109.
- [10] R. Behrends, R. Filkenstein and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.* **101** (1955) 866; S. Berman, *Phys. Rev.* **112** (1958) 267; T. Kinoshita and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.* **B113** (1959) 1652.
- [11] A. Ali and E. Pietarinen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B154** (1979) 519.
- [12] T.H. Chang, K.J.F. Gaemers and W.L. van Neerven, *Nucl. Phys.* **B202** (1980) 407.
- [13] A. Czarnecki, *Phys. Lett.* **252B** (1990) 467.
- [14] C.S. Li, R.J. Oakes and T.C. Yuan, *Phys. Rev.* **D43** (1991) 3759.
- [15] J. Liu and Y.-P. Yao, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A6** (1991) 4925.
- [16] G. Altarelli, *QCD and Experiment: Status of  $\alpha_s$* , in P.M. Zerwas and H.A. Kastrup (eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop: QCD - 20 Years Later*, (June 1992, Aachen), World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore; preprint CERN-TH.6623/92.
- [17] B.A. Irwin, B. Margolis and H.D. Trotier, *Phys. Lett.* **256B** (1991) 533.
- [18] A. Hoang, private communication.